



## MEETING MINUTES – DEL MEDIO PARK NEIGHBORHOOD MTG. #2

Meeting Date / Time: Monday March 29, 2010; 6:30 PM. Community School of Music & Art

Attendees: Anne Marie Starr – Senior Project Manager, City of Mountain View Public Works Dept.  
Bob Kagiya – Principal Civil Engineer, City of Mountain View Public Works Dept.  
Dave Muela – Community Services Director, City of Mountain View Community Services Dept.  
Bruce Hurlburt – Parks and Open Space Manager, City of Mountain View Community Services Dept.  
Steve Sutherland – Principal, SSA Landscape Architects, Inc.  
Scott Reeves – Senior Project Manager, SSA Landscape Architects, Inc.  
Community Attendees: 6

---

Contained herein is a summary of the items discussed during the neighborhood meeting for the Del Medio Park in the City of Mountain View. These notes were prepared from the discussions and conclusions of the meeting.

### I. Introductions:

- a. Welcome - Ms. Starr welcomed the community members in attendance, introduced the project team and encouraged attendees to sign in.
- b. A brief overview of what has occurred up to this point was given, which included a brief mention of the previous neighborhood meeting
- c. Meeting process
  - i. The purpose of the neighborhood meeting was to provide background on the project and acquire feedback on the preferred concept prepared which was prepared as a direct result of the previous neighborhood meeting.
  - ii. The end goal was to have consensus on a design to present to PRC.
- d. Next steps
  - i. Demolition has been slated to take place in about a month
  - ii. PRC Meeting – Formal hearing with opportunity to view final park design and provide feedback is scheduled for May 12, 2010.

### II. Park Introduction:

- a. Park location - Mr. Reeves identified the park site on Del Medio Avenue between Miller Avenue and California Street in the City of Mountain View
- b. Inventory - Mr. Reeves took a brief look at the site boundary and existing vegetation to remain.
- c. Type of park – The proposed park was identified as a mini-park site
  - i. Acceptable program elements at a park of this size were identified to include play equipment, grass, and picnic areas.
  - ii. Neighboring Parks and Facilities along with their programmed activities were identified and used as comparison.

### III. First Workshop Recap:

- a. The team reviewed the 3 concepts shown at the first workshop.
  - i. Concept A
    1. Two entrances

2. Covered (trellis) picnic area
3. Trail for access to native grass area
4. Buffer planting around perimeter
5. One Medium sized play area
6. One Medium sized flat turf area
- ii. Concept B
  1. One central entrance, dividing play areas into age specific areas
  2. Large formal picnic area with shade from trees
  3. Seat wall enclosing two small sized play areas
  4. Focal point with specimen tree
  5. Two grassy mound areas
  6. Raised planters with ornamental plantings
  7. Informal access to native planting area
  8. Buffer planting around perimeter
- iii. Concept C
  1. Two entrances
  2. One larger play area
  3. Two smaller picnic areas
  4. Large flat turf area
  5. Buffer planting around perimeter
- b. The team reviewed and summarized the results of the questionnaire which was distributed at the first workshop.
  - i. Concept C voted as the favorite concept.
    1. Large flat turf area among Concept C's favorite features
    2. Natural area with trail noted as a good feature on Concept C
    3. Good balance of different program elements noted as desired for preferred concept.
  - ii. Program elements voting results
    1. Nature area was voted as the most desired program element because it would serve adult users, elders and families with no children.
    2. Grass area for informal sports was also a favorite.
    3. Walking Trail received the third most amount of votes from attendees.
    4. Play Structure for a 5-12 year old age group received the least amount of votes.
- c. The team reviewed and summarized the 'Buy you furnishings' exercise results
  - i. Picnic tables were voted the most desired furnishing for the park
  - ii. Fitness equipment was voted the second most desired furnishing
  - iii. Game tables received the third most amount of votes.

#### IV. **Concept plan and discussion:**

- a. A preferred concept plan was presented to the public that took into account feedback from both the City and the community, with a summary of the design features.
  - i. Fitness Equipment was incorporated into the design to serve park users
  - ii. An informal trail is located toward the rear of the site among native plantings
  - iii. Play equipment for 2 – 12 is strategically placed between the natural trail and the street and includes swings, independent play features and a traditional play structure.
  - iv. A large flat turf area is adjacent to the Del Medio Ave and next to the play area.
  - v. Ornamental planting is provided along the front
  - vi. One Picnic area, located near the 2-5 age group play structure and sand play components

- vii. Split rail or neighborhood fence along park front to embrace the neighborhood feel.
- viii. Preserve Pepper, Loquat and Redwood trees.
- b. An open conversation concluded the presentation, with attendees encouraged to discuss their likes / dislikes. It was also discussed that this would be an excellent time for attendees to voice any concerns about the current design, because the design should represent their desires and expectations.
  - i. One attendee commented that she liked the preferred concept and wants some clarification as to how large the park site is compared to nearby Monroe Park. *Scott informed the attendees that the park site is .35 acres. Anne Marie stated that Monroe is twice as big as the Del Medio site or bigger.*
  - ii. A different attendee commented that he is most likely to use the adult fitness equipment and is happy it was incorporated into the design.
  - iii. An individual ask what type of surfacing will be used in the play area. *Scott informed the attendees that the play area will have poured in place rubber surfacing, with a sand play area at the edge.*
  - iv. The youngest attendee, a three year old, said he would like to see a turtle, sand toy and a train incorporated into the design.
  - v. One attendee asked that the design team consider an enclosed platform play structure to protect the smallest children, such as his son, from falls. He also commended the design team for using the space wisely.
  - vi. An attendee that attended the previous meeting commented that he was glad the design team chose to incorporate the natural trail and adult fitness for residents of the neighborhood with no kids.
  - vii. An individual asked if there was a budget for the park. *Scott informed the attendees that the project is funded through construction documents. He also stated that a probable estimate of construction costs would be determined once those construction documents were completed.*

## V. Re-visit Schedule and Wrap Up:

- a. Schedule
  - i. PRC presentation – Will occur May 12 and is the next opportunity for neighbors to comment on the Park Design.
  - ii. The park is slated for construction in spring of 2011.
  - iii. Everyone is encouraged to stay involved and visit the City website for more details, and to review and comment on the updated design.
- b. Thanks you and reminder
  - i. All attendees should sign in to receive future direct notifications regarding the park process and the next public forum for comment.